

REMARKS

1. Pursuant to the requirement for restriction, Applicant provisionally elects the invention classified in Group I to which claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 have been indicated to be directed by the Examiner.

2. Pursuant to the requirement of election of species, Applicant elects the species of claim 7 to which claims may be directed in the event no generic claim is allowable.

Claim 7 is readable upon that species along with claims 1 and 6 which are generic or subgeneric thereto and claims 2 to 4.

3. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the classification of claims 3 and 4 as separate from the Group I claims and reinstatement of claims 3 and 4 in Group I. Group I has been defined as the group of claims drawn to the monofilament.

Claims 3 and 4 as drawn are likewise directed to a monofilament and neither the fact that these claims are to a sheath and core configuration or a side by side configuration can alter the fact that these claims are also directed to a monofilament.


Indeed, claims 3 and 4 only further limit the subject matter of claim 1 and to that extent claim 1 must be considered a linking claim between Group I and what has been defined as Group II.

Consequently, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 4 are best properly examined in Group I and requests that they be considered as part of the elected group.

4. The requirement for restriction between Group III and Groups I and II is respectfully traversed on the ground that the allegedly materially different processes recited by the Examiner are not at all different from that recited in claim 8. Spinning is what claim 8 does, the spinning can very well be a coextrusion, the step of applying the bonding agent and the second layer is layering. As far as cooling, drawing and winding are concerned, those are not excluded in the Group I and Group II claims. In other words, the Examiner has not cited any materially different process from that which is covered by claims 8 to 11 for making the product of claim 1 and Applicant does not believe that any such materially different process can exist. Accordingly, the restriction requirement between the Group I/II claims and the Group III claims should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, Applicant requests merger of claims 3 and 4 with the Group I claims and an action on the merits of the Group I claims including claims 3 and 4 even if the restriction requirement is upheld with respect to the Group III claims.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.



By: Herbert Dubno, Reg. No. 19,752
Attorney for Applicant

db-
DATED: November 2, 2004
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099